

MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, ILLINOIS
708 MENTAL HEALTH BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2017

1. Opening of Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Barb Gacic at 6:10 pm.

2. Roll Call

Members Present: Chair. Barb Gacic, Carla Cumblad, Michael Cohen, Ron Silkaitis, Carolyn Waibel and Ron Weddell

Absent: Mary Hughes

Others Present: Tracey Conti

Barb: The first order of business is to go over the new agency presentation format. Originally I anticipated more than just the one agency coming. I thought we should have a meeting similar to what we had last year when Chief Keegan presented. We only have the one agency which is Linden Oaks.

If we moved Linden Oaks to the last presentation of the evening they could have 20 minutes instead of the 10 minutes we're allotting everyone else. We wouldn't have to have a separate meeting and they would get the same allotment of time that has been given in the past for their initial presentation.

Carla: When Barb talked about bringing some new people in, Barb and I had a conversation. I don't want this group to feel like anyone is getting special treatment. If we are going to entertain new presentations because we don't know them, then we should decide as a group if that's what we want to do.

Barb: Years ago it didn't matter because everybody got 20 minutes. Now everyone gets standard questions, and it's deviated from what it used to be. I agree with you and I'm glad you brought it up.

Carla: Last year the Chief did a special presentation and when we went to funding we kind of felt obliged, although clearly it was a good thing. I don't want us to be in a circumstance where we feel that we've given preferential treatment to someone. We should be as objective as possible, and that as stewards of the public money, we're fair to everyone.

Ron S. If we bring them in does that mean we're obligated to fund them, or can we decide against it?

Barb: We've had people present in the past and we've had agencies who haven't received funding for a variety of reasons. Occasionally we've had 1 or 2 and for whatever reason we didn't feel they met the criteria. Linden Oaks is coming back. We did not fund them the first time they came.

Ron W.: I read Linden Oaks application and it's completely different from last time.

Ron S.: How many organizations do we want to fund? The more you fund the more goes toward administrative expenses, instead of actual treatment. Every group you pay administrative fees.

Carolyn: You can't limit the number of people you fund.

Barb: We've been very constant in the number of agencies we've funded.

Ron S.: I understand. I'm just asking how many more do we want to add?

Barb: I think we have to evaluate each agency that applies. We have to allow them to apply and we have to evaluate each agency that comes, because you may have someone that has never come to us. How can we turn down an agency that does exactly what our bylaws say we have to be looking for?

Ron S.: This is just a comment - it leaves less money for all the other groups. How do you balance that?

Barb: That brings me to something I'd like to share with you. I haven't received the final blessing, but the number should be \$547,550 this year. That would leave us with a fund balance reserve of \$800. This is relative to the actual tax dollars coming in. We ended this year, when we thought we spent it down to nothing, with a fund balance of \$13,750.

Ron S.: There is no reason for that.

Barb: We spent it down. We just got more tax dollars in.

Ron W.: Does that total include the \$13,750 carry over?

Barb: Yes. It's about \$27,000 more than last year, and because Chief Keegan is not asking for funding this year that's an additional \$15,000 that goes back into the pot as well. I haven't had an opportunity to sit down and look at the numbers. It will be done by February 23. Keep in

mind these are still tentative numbers. I may or may not have the actual number by February 15. This is going to be really close and a good starting point for us.

Carolyn: We have no other money coming in from City Hall.

Barb: No. We were turned down on the request in October.

Carla: I feel like we need to have record of something that we all agree to do. I didn't realize that Linden Oaks had been here before. Are they new?

Barb: They are new. They are here from St. Charles, before they were only out of Naperville. Their proposal was to come into the school system.

Carla: We just need to decide, for new applicants we either schedule a separate meeting, or decide that on the funding night we reserve some time. I want to have it somewhere on the record that we decide what we want to do as a group.

Barb: If we have 1 or 2 new applicants we can do it the night of the presentations. If there are 3 or more, we should plan on a having a meeting prior.

Michael: This year we have 2 new agencies.

Carolyn: We originally had 4. Now we're down to 1.

Barb: As agencies inquired I answered questions, and the previous year's application was sent to them so they could get an idea of what we're looking for. We did that with a group called Portrait Health Foundation, Celebrate Differences, and Fox Valley Food for Health. Linden Oaks was the only one who applied. Tracey let the people know the application was out there. It's possible that once they saw the application they knew they wouldn't qualify for whatever reason.

Do we have a motion as to how we want to do this going forward?

Motion by Cumblad, Second by Waibel that if 1 or 2 new applicants come forward in a funding year; each applicant will receive a 20 minute time slot on funding night for presentations. If there are 3 or more new applicants in a funding year; additional information will be reviewed, in 20 minute time slots, at a meeting that will be scheduled separately.

Voice Vote: Ayes: 6; Nays: 0; Absent: 1; Chair. Gacic did not vote as Chair.

Motion Carried

Barb: We have a guest speaker coming on February 15, 2017. She will be the first item on the agenda. Her name is Alicia Schatteman; she is the NIU professor who has been working with the outcome based data analysis. Before we go forward with mandatory outcome based requests, I think it's good to hear from someone who is actually doing research on it.

Carolyn: We didn't put it on this application?

Barb: No. We asked if they have it to provide it.

A roundtable discussion was had regarding the agenda for the February 15, 2017 meeting.

Michael: When we talk about funding, and I think most of them, but not all of them are doing this, if they are asking for funds for special programs, that's where their outcomes should be based. One agency, I think it's AID, is breaking their amount down into 15 different categories, they would then have to present outcome measures on each of the 15 categories that were specified.

Barb: AID probably is.

Michael: I don't know. It's how they are structuring it, none of its going towards the general fund.

Barb: They are using it at restricted funding rather than general funding.

Michael: I don't think we should give anything to go into general funding.

Ron S.: It's restricted to St. Charles residents.

Barb: It has to be restricted to St. Charles residents.

Barb: My question, for this open discussion is; we are a 708 Board, not an INC. Board, who is going to monitor this throughout the year? We give them \$10,000 or restricted funding for A., in September A. goes under for whatever reason, the program doesn't work, they still have \$5,000 that they haven't spent. How are we going to know they still have that \$5,000 that hasn't been spent, and who is going to give them the authorization to either spend the \$5,000 for something different, or how do we get it back? I need to know the logistics. We're not a board that has people to monitor.

Michael: If they are coming forward for \$10,000 to do a program, and they decide 6 months in that they aren't going to do the program, and they take half the money and use it for A. I don't see how they could do that because they are coming to us for money for a specific program. If they don't say anything, we never know. We're not going to monitor.

Barb: That's what the INC. Board does.

Michael: If that's what happens that an ethical dilemma. If they ask for \$10,000 for one thing and use it for another, they can't do that.

Ron S.: We're not an INC. Board. The finance department actually controls the money. The City of St. Charles collects the money, therefore we can actually tell them, I believe.

Barb: There again. Who's going to monitor this? We're a volunteer board.

Ron S.: We could ask the finance department to do it.

Barb: Then the 1% we're being charged for administration fees is going to go up. A lot of the boards that do this, they're averaging 8% - 15% in administrative fees. That's the entire argument behind the Kane County Mental Health Advisory Committee, is if they can get a county wide thing they can cut the administrative fees.

Ron S.: I do believe it still needs to be monitored. It's good business practice, hold them accountable.

Ron W.: We're relying on their good faith.

Ron S.: Half way through the year we could ask for a report.

Barb: Anyone who gets over \$25,000 dollars sends in their financial statements.

Ron W.: After the first dispersal in August we could ask if the funds are being used as targeted before we send out the second dispersal. If they're not using it as targeted, why give them the second payment. It gets really complicated though.

Carla: I think this gets wrapped up in the discussion of outcomes and what our expectations are. We should consider continuation applications, because most of them are continuations. We should restructure the applications and have them include how the money will be used, break it down, and then show the outcomes, and justification for what they would like to do the following year.

For new applicants we would like to know more about their mission and general information. We may want to think about restructuring the application. Personally, I don't think checking people's finances will make much difference.

Carolyn: They can put whatever they want to say in a report.

Carla: I don't think personally, that it's our job to look at invoices, but have they spent the money wisely? They are probably audited in some way. There has to be some type of happy medium.

Michael: If they are asking for \$10,000 and that they are spending it on A., I don't think there is any way of finding out if they are doing that. I think if they are asking for \$10,000 for whatever program, position, etc., that their outcome measures reflect exactly where that money is going. We can now see if this is beneficial of how we are giving money.

Carla: It would be nice if we got a short report showing what was proposed and what was done, and if they have some outcomes.

Barb: Do a lookback and tell us what the outcomes are based on what you proposed last year.

Michael: Outcome measures can be done by anyone, and I would think that these agencies have to be doing some type of outcome measurements.

Barb: I have gone through the applications looking specifically for that information. ElderDay, who has an interim director, indicated on the application "non- applicable" I contacted them and asked that they look into it further because the previous director told us that's how they got their measurements in previous years.

Ron W.: Wredling, had a ledger, like a petty cash dispersal record, of each and every check, maybe 40 items that they gave to teachers that came up to the money we gave them last year. That doesn't detail how that money was allocated per program. The individual disbursements aren't tied into the total of what they did per program.

Michael: We need to know how they are breaking down the money we are giving them. All the other stuff they do in the grand picture of the agency doesn't have a lot of value to us. We're focused on the money we are giving them.

Carla: We think about the money as if it's a special thing, or perhaps an add-on, but some of these agencies look to this organization to be able to support the activities they already do, and to be able to offset some of the losses they are seeing elsewhere. I think we have to be sensitive to that.

Michael: I take a different stance. However it's broken down, if they take it and use it for general fund, that's their ethical dilemma to deal with, but if they state they are using it for a counseling program, that's what it should be used for. For me they should show performance measurements and outcomes based on that.

Barb: Lets have Alicia come in and see what she has to say, what her findings are through her almost year-long analysis, and then we'll go on from there.

I think we are going to need a meeting sometime at the end of June, rather than coming up with these decisions, and redo the application, before the funding meeting, to come up with a final decision on what we're going to do and how to present it on the applications. I think that right now we need to concentrate on presentations and what questions we need to be asking them this year.

Michael: At the end of the presentations, can we say that in the upcoming year you will be required to do performance measurements?

Barb: I would like to say we are anticipating requiring this. I don't feel that until we have listened to Alicia's presentation and spend some time talking it through; I don't think we can say it's the way it's going to be.

Michael: Just from experience, we get funding from a mental health board, we do all sorts of performance measurements and it's a paragraph, if that, stating what we found.

Barb: Before the meeting, give Tracey a copy of what you fill out and she will distribute to everyone. It would be one more tool for us to use. We're not going to make a decision tonight; we'll wait until end of June, early part of July, when Tracey has had the time to do the minutes for the meeting.

Last year our questions were:

What's particular in your application that will benefit St. Charles residents with 708 funding this coming year?

How are you preparing for future state cutbacks? Please concisely describe what your future looks like for the next year as the stalemate continues.

Though you don't directly receive state funding, has the lack of a state budget affected your agency and the clients you serve directly or indirectly?

There may or may not be a state budget in the next two weeks. I think that some of our agencies are very close to the brink.

Carla: Regarding the state question. Did it have any influence on our decisions?

Carolyn: I think it was helpful for the smaller agencies.

Barb: Tracey will send out the draft of the minutes.

Carla: If it doesn't make any difference one way or the other how they answer, should we be asking the question:

Carolyn: Is it relevant?

Ron S.: Don't most of them get state funding.

Barb: About 50% don't.

Carla: I would like to ask if there is anything they would like to highlight on their application that is different from their previous applications. Reading them from year to year they sound the same.

Carolyn: A new program.

Michael: Talk about what you spent the money on in the previous year and how did it go?

A roundtable discussion was had regarding new questions to ask agencies coming forward.

Carla: Why don't you type up the questions and send them out for review, and what questions would you like to ask new applicants.

Barb: I would like 10 minutes of them giving us a presentation telling us what they are anticipating, from where they started, where they will be going, are you meeting or exceeding goals, where do you see yourselves in a year?

I think when Tracey sends out the time change I will have given her the questions to include, so they are prepared to answer.

Carolyn: We should agree on what those questions are together before you send those out.

A roundtable discussion was had regarding Edward Foundations application.

Barb: Tracey you can switch NAMI and Edwards on the schedule.

Carolyn: Would you like us to have the applications read by the 15th or the 23rd.

Barb: I would love to have it done by the 15th, but seeing as how I can't commit to that myself, the 23rd. My bigger concern is on the 15th that we have come up with questions. If you have them done ahead of time, send them to Tracey and she'll forward them to me. The reason why

we narrowed it to 2 is because we were tired of the same presentations every year. Then we had the third question that was agency specific. That was the reasoning behind the change.

Motion by Cumblad, second by Waibel to adjourn meeting.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous; Nays: 0; Absent: 1; Chair. Gacic did not vote as Chair.

Motion Carried.